

## **REMARKS**

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as they must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the linked dispensing units must be shown or the feature cancelled from the claims.

Since applicant has cancelled claim 10, there is no need to amend any of the drawings.

The Examiner has rejected claim 10 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner has rejected claim 10 as being indefinite.

Applicant has cancelled claim 10.

Applicant feels the need to describe the invention presented in the present application based on the Examiner's statements in the Office Action. The invention relates to providing a secondary supplemental prize based on the play of a particular gaming machine. The outcome of the underlining gaming machine during the play has no effect on the supplemental bonus.

For example, a visual display on a gaming machine can show a user that \$20 must be placed and played on that particular gaming machine in order for a ticket to be dispensed from the ticket dispensing apparatus. The user can then play for example, \$10 worth of coins in that gaming machine, the numeric counter would then read that \$10 of coins has been played in that machine and that ten more dollars must be played in that machine in order for a ticket to be generated. The user could have won on that gaming machine any number of times and not effect the supplemental bonus award. That user may then use the

machine and a new user may then start placing coin in that gaming machine and add to the prior \$10 placed on the machine. If that user then places \$10 in the gaming machine, and reaches the \$20 which is displayed to the user as what is needed to generate a ticket, that user will then have a ticket dispensed to them. The machine then resets the counter to zero and \$20 in coins must then be placed in the machine in order to generate a further ticket.

Okuniewicz states specifically at col. 1 lines 43-46 that "There is therefore a need for a bonusing system which produces a bonus which is randomly generated and includes a bonusing factor beyond mere credits." Further at col. 2 lines 17-21, it is stated, "There is therefore a need for an interface between a slot machine and a lottery terminal to permit the dispensing of lottery tickets in response to particular reel combinations or particular events occurring on the slot machine board, thereby enhancing game play."

Okuniewicz teaches a bonusing system which is random and based on an event that occurs at the slot machine. By its very description, Okuniewicz does not teach and in fact teaches away from alerting the user to when a ticket will be dispensed to the user. The idea behind Okuniewicz is that the tickets are given out randomly so that the player does not know when the tickets will be given out and continues to play the machine any way. This goes against the teachings of the present invention.

Quinn relates to a central computer that controls remote vending machines through long distance communication lines wherein the vending

machine in response to instructions from the computer, prints and issues valuable documents such as entertainment tickets, lottery tickets, race tickets and the like. The problem solved by Quinn is that tickets must be physically distributed to the sales center and physically returned in the event they are not sold prior to the performance. In the event that a miscalculation takes place and one sales center sells out, there is no means for informing that sales center that others have tickets available, other than time consuming phone calls. Quinn improves on the methods of distributing tickets and other forms of variable script in that it provides a centralized computer controlling remote variable script vending machine over communications systems where the consumer can make the selection, the computer will instruct the consumer whether its selection is available or another selection must be made. If available, the computer will instruct the consumer on how much currency must be inserted into the vending machine. The computer will recognize the correct currency inserted, and if correct, the computer will instruct the vending machine to follow its additional instructions to print out a ticket or other form of script. As stated at Col. 2 lines 16-20, "It should be pointed out that it is the purpose of this invention to provide a system for printing out active script, that is the actual ticket to be used by the purchaser.

Because Quinn relates to solving the problem of providing active script to a user from a vending machine, and Okuniewicz relates to adding a random

bonus to a slot machine game, there is absolutely no reason to combine the references to teach the invention as claimed.

The present invention as claimed in claim 1 requires a gaming machine wherein the gaming machine comprises a processor, and the processor implements a game of chance on the gaming machine, the game of chance paying off according to matching of symbols; or the gaming machine comprising a video poker machine, a video keno machine or a video bingo machine.

Claim 1 further requires a dispensing unit comprising a numeric counter for counting the number of coins placed in the gaming machine and visually displaying to the player the number of coins. The numeric counter continues to count coins until a ticket is generated. The numeric counter resets the counted coins to zero once a ticket is generated. The dispensing unit further comprises a visual display showing a player number of coins needed to generate a ticket; and the dispensing unit further comprises a ticket dispensing apparatus.

It is necessary for the present invention to show how much coins have been placed into the gaming machine and further show the user the number of coins needed to generate a ticket. The claims further teach that the gaming machine must have a processor for implementing a game of chance.

There is no reason for Okuniewicz to have the features regarding showing the coins necessary for a ticket, when the ticket is given randomly. Further there is no reason to combine Quinn which teaches a ticket dispenser with Okuniewicz which teaches a gaming machine. Therefore the claims of the present invention are not obvious over the prior art.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12, 14-17 as being obvious over Okuniewicz, 6,585,589 in view of Quinn, 3,688,276.

**Claim 1:** The Examiner states that Okuniewicz teaches devices for paying out a bonus (Col. 1 lines 43-46) to a player playing a gaming machine. (Fig. 1). There is a gaming machine (Slot Machine). There is a dispensing unit (Lottery Terminal). Since Okuniewicz teaches that the dispensing unit may dispense a ticket when a preset amount of coins are inserted (Col. 3 lines 46-53), there must be a numeric counter for counting the number of coins placed in said gaming machine that counts coins until a ticket is generated. Okuniewicz does not teach visually displaying to the player the number of coins needed to generate a ticket or the number of coins inserted by the player. Nor does Okuniewicz teach resetting the counted coins to zero once a ticket is generated. These are common functions on virtually any modern vending machine.

As stated above these are not common functions to Okuniewicz as Okuniewicz teaches that the tickets are distributed randomly and therefore, teaches against advising the player about how many coins are placed in the dispenser and how many coins are necessary before a ticket is distributed.

Quinn which is also a lottery ticket dispenser, teaches visually displaying to the player the number of coins needed to generate a ticket and the number of coins inserted by the player as well as resetting the

counted coins to zero once a ticket is generated. (Fig. 1). Such a viable meter allows the player to know how much money he must insert and how much money he has inserted. Clearing the counter lets the player know that if he wants another ticket, he has to put in more money.

These features add to user convenience and are, as previously pointed out, extremely well known. It would have been obvious to have modified Okuniewicz in view of Quinn to visually display to the player the number of coins needed to generate a ticket and the number of coins inserted by the player as well as to reset the counted coins to zero once a ticket is generated in order to add to player convenience.

The Examiner agrees that Okuniewicz does not

1. visually display to the user the number of coins placed in the gaming machine by the user.
2. reset the counted coins to zero once a ticket is generated.
3. visually display to the user the number of coins needed to generate a ticket.

Okuniewicz states that the invention relates to a bonusing system which produces a bonus which is randomly generated and includes a bonusing factor beyond mere credits. Col. 1 lines 44-46. Okuniewicz teaches that a device detects electronically a certain event, and then based on the event supplies a lottery ticket from a lottery terminal. There is nothing in Okuniewicz that teaches visually showing a player when a lottery ticket will be generated. The

teachings of Okuniewicz teaches that the ticket be given out randomly based on certain events. The present invention teaches that a user stays on the gaming machine and plays the machine longer until the user sees that the amount of coins placed in the machine matches the number of coins needed to generate a ticket.

Further, Quinn only teaches putting money in a vending machine to buy a lottery ticket. As stated above Quinn solves the problem of having tickets printed which are not used. There is nothing taught in Okuniewicz to combine the teachings with Quinn and in fact Okuniewicz teaches against it. Further Okuniewicz teaches the dispensing of the tickets to be random, whereas Quinn teaches a lottery ticket is dispensed once the correct amount of money is paid for the ticket.

Therefore, claim 1 is not obvious based on Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

**Claims 2-4:** The Examiner states that Okuniewicz teaches that the dispensing unit may be a retrofit unit for a slot machine (Col. 3, lines 1-4). Okuniewicz teaches that the dispensing unit could be attached to the gaming machine externally (i.e., side-mounted) or mounted internally. (Col 4, lines 63-66).

For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claims 2-4 are not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

**Claim 5:** The Examiner states that the gaming machine may include video poker machines (Col. 3 lines 36-42). Video bingo games and video keno games are disclosed as equivalents.

For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 5 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

**Claim 6:** The dispensing unit is a self-contained unit that does not affect the play or outcome of the gaming machine (Col 4 lines 35-43).

For the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 6 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

**Claims 9, 14:** Okuniewicz dispenses lottery tickets. (Abstract)

Regarding claim 9, for the reasons stated above for claim 1, claim 9 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

Regarding claim 14, for the reasons stated below for claim 12, claim 14 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

**Claim 10:** Okuniewicz teaches that the dispensing units are linked (to the gaming machine which are then linked in a network) so that the combination of dispensing units (i.e., the slot machine/lottery terminal combination) has to have a certain number of coins inserted before a ticket is dispensed. (Col. 3, line 51). If a certain number of coins is inserted into a single dispensing unit, then it issues a ticket. This meets the limitation of the claim because the certain number of coins is inserted into the combination of dispensing units. Applicant does not claim that the coins must be inserted into different dispensing units

within the combination, nor does applicant's specification support such a combination.

For the reasons stated above for claim 1 above, claim 10 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

**Claims 12, 17:** Claim 12 is a combination of claims 1 and 5. Claim 17 is a subset of claim 1.

Claim 12 requires that the device count the coins the player places in the gaming machine, and show the number of counted coins to the player. As stated above and agreed on by the Examiner, that Okuniewicz does not teach this. And as stated above in the description of the present invention and the description of the prior art, there is no reason to combine and in fact it is taught away to combine Okuniewicz and Quinn. Therefore claim 12 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

As stated above and agreed upon by the Examiner, Okuniewicz does not teach as required by Claim 17 that the number of counted coins is set to zero once a ticket is dispensed. Further for the reasons stated above, claim 17 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

**Claim 15:** The Examiner states that Okuniewicz teaches holding a drawing to determine a winner of said ticket.

For the reasons stated above for claim 12, claim 15 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

**Claim 16:** Okuniewicz teaches the lottery ticket may be for the Big Game. In the Big Game, a bonus prize is generated from a percentage of total

coins placed into all participating gaming machines (i.e., a percentage of money used to buy game tickets).

For the reasons stated above for claim 12, claim 16 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7, 8, 11, 13, and 18 as being obvious over Okuniewicz and Quinn as applied to claims 1, 12 and further in view of Castellano, 5,477,952.

**Claim 7, 13:** The Examiner states that Okuniewicz and Quinn teach the invention substantially as claimed. Both contain coin counters, but do not give details of the operation thereof. Okuniewicz bonuses a player based on number of coins played (Col. 3, line 51) but does not teach that the numeric counter counts coin pulses off of the gaming machines hard meter. Castellano teaches that the numeric counter (12) counts coin pulses off of the gaming machines hard meter (52). The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to have modified Okuniewicz and Quinn in view of Castellano to have the numeric counter count coin pulses off of the gaming machine's hard meter in order to carry out Okuniewicz and Quinn's suggestion to count the coins entered by the player.

Claim 7 requires that the numeric counter counts coin pulses off of the gaming machine's hard meter, and bonuses a player based on the number of coins or pulses played. Further claim 7 requires that the bonus be paid on a single gaming machine.

Castellano does not teach awarding the player a bonus based on the number of coins played. Further Castellano does not teach awarding a lottery ticket. There is no reason for combining Castellano with Okuniewicz and Quinn. Further for the reasons stated above, Claim 7 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn and further in view of Castellano.

Regarding claim 13, the counting the coins is accomplished by counting coin pulses off of the machine's hard meter and the ticket is dispensed base on the number of coins deposited.

Castellano does not teach awarding the player a bonus based on the number of coins played. Further Castellano does not teach awarding a lottery ticket. There is no reason for combining Castellano with Okuniewicz and Quinn. Further for the reasons stated above, Claim 13 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn and further in view of Castellano.

**Claim 8:** Okuniewicz and Quinn teach the invention substantially as claimed. Neither specifically discloses that the numeric counter can count various coin denominations. Castellano specifically teaches that the numeric counter can count various coin denominations. (Fig 1, 21-24) Allowing players to use more than one denomination makes it convenient for the players to put more money in the slot machine. This increases profits. It would have been obvious to have modified Okuniewicz and

Quinn in view of Castellano to have the numeric counter can count various coin denominations in order to make it convenient for the player to put more money in the slot machine.

There is no reason for combining Castellano with Okuniewicz and Quinn. Further for the reasons stated above, Claim 8 is not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn and further in view of Castellano.

**Claims 11, 18:** Okuniewicz teaches that the benefit of the device is the ability to change the criteria for generating a ticket. (Col. 3, 1-9). The LIB is a remote unit (i.e., a separate module) for changing the number of coins necessary to generate said ticket.

Regarding claim 11 and 18, for the reasons stated above for claims 1 and 12, respectively claims 11 and 18 are not obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn and further in view of Castellano.

In response to applicant's arguments that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the Examiner states that it is well-known to the art that visible coin in meters add to player convenience. People like to know how many coins they have put into a machine and how many more coins they need to put in to make their purchase. Such visible coin in meters are extremely well known to the art, as is the reasons for including them.

Certain devices may have visible coin in meters, however, Okuniewicz teaches against using such a device, as he states that the

distribution of a ticket is at random, and therefore he does not want to show the user the amount of coins that are placed in the machine, as that would cause the distribution of the ticket to be non-random.

Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance.

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No. EV 685801085 US  
Date of Deposit: November 30, 2005  
I hereby certify that this paper (and any document(s) attached herewith  
Is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail  
Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the  
date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner  
for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on  
November 30, 2005

Signature: Maureen P. Herbst  
Name: Maureen P. Herbst

Respectfully submitted,

  
Philip M. Weiss  
Reg. No. 34,751  
Attorney for Applicant  
Weiss & Weiss  
300 Old Country Rd., Ste. 251  
Mineola, NY 11501  
(516) 739-1500